



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,280	09/30/2002	Jeffrey C. Leung	2284.40532	5694
83532	7590	11/25/2011		
ANGIOTECH 1633 Westlake Avenue N., Ste. 400 Seattle, WA 98109			EXAMINER DOWE, KATHERINE MARIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

angiotechpatents@angio.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,280	LEUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KATHERINE DOWE	3734	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) KATHERINE DOWE. (3) ____.
- (2) DAVID PARKER. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 17 November 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☐103 ☐Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Buncke (US 5,931,855) and Morency (US 2003/0149447).

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Discussed the interpretation of the claim language "where the underside [of the barbs] projects from the body along a line transverse to the longitudinal axis of the body, the line being arcuate" with respect to Applicant's intention that the arcuate base on the underside of the barb is the where the barb is attached to the suture body. Noted that claim amendments further clarifying the structure of the barb and the arcuate base will overcome the present rejection over Buncke. However, Morency teaches a curved barb with an arcuate base as discussed in the July 28, 2010 Office Action. No agreement on allowable subject matter was reached.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☒ Attachment

/Katherine M Dowe/
Examiner, Art Unit 3734